

found in the Dazey patent. In particular, the Examiner relies on the Abstract, the Summary of the Invention, and Figure 5. He also points to col. 4, lines 46-67, and col. 2, lines 16-22.

The Examiner takes the position that the first display means is shown as Item 50 in Figure 5 and the second display means is shown as Item 70 in Figure 5. With regard to the means for separately routing the main window exclusively to the first display and the auxiliary information exclusively to the second display so that display of the auxiliary information does not overlap the display of the main window, the Examiner relies on the discussion at col. 4, lines 46-67 and in particular, the quotation taken from col. 2, lines 16-22, that “when the user requires help, the user activates a button on the user interface to show the help content. The graphical window containing the application is partitioned to define a help pane which shows the help content. The help pane is integrated into and appears positioned adjacent to a workspace to assist the user with context specific, step-by-step, instructions.”

A careful reading of the Dazey patent shows that the computer application with help pane suffers from the same shortcomings as the rest of the prior art, namely, that where there is a dedicated main window of an application program displayed on a screen, whenever auxiliary information is to be displayed, it at some point overlaps the application program in the main window and invades the exclusive display area for the main window.

The Examiner's attention is directed to col. 5, lines 27-37. That portion of the specification is reproduced as follows:

When the help pane 70 is displayed, it encroaches on the workspace 50 and may initially cover a portion of the publication 52. In the illustrated drawing, the help pane 70 covers almost one half of the workspace. For normal size computer monitors, however, the help pane 70 covers a far less percentage of the workspace 50. To ensure that the entire publication can be viewed

when the help pane 70 is displayed, the publication 52 is re-sized within the workspace 50. Figure 5 shows the application window 44 with an active help pane 70 and the publication 52 re-sized within workspace 50 to be visible to the user.

Thus, it can be seen that the Dazey patent does not teach every element of claim 1 so that the claim cannot be rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by the Dazey patent.

In fact, the Dazey patent actually teaches away from the present invention as provided for in claim 1 by requiring that the window 50 be resized to make room for the help screen after the help screen overlaps the window. This is shown graphically in Figures 3 and 4 where the window 50 is at its full size in Figure 3 and then, after having been overlapped by the help window 70, is resized in Figure 4.

In this way, Dazey does not teach the first and second dedicated displays where the first display only displays a main window of an application program and the second display only displays auxiliary information. Further, the reference does not teach the use of a device for separately routing the main window exclusively to the first display area and the auxiliary information exclusively to the second display area so that the display of the auxiliary information never overlaps the display of the main window. In fact, according to the Dazey patent, the help pane 70 is actually displayed in the display area that was previously occupied by the window 50.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that in light of the shortcomings of the Dazey patent, the Dazey patent, taken alone or in combination with any of the references of record, does not teach or suggest that which Applicants regard as their invention as provided for in amended claim 1.

Claims 2 through 11 can trace their dependence to claim 1 and as such incorporate the limitations of that claim. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2 through 11 are likewise in condition for allowance. Further, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 through 11 are neither anticipated nor made obvious by any of the references of record taken alone or in combination.

Turning now to independent claim 12, this claim relates to a method for displaying auxiliary information to prevent overlap with display of a main window of an application program. The Examiner has again applied the Dazey patent under 35 U.S.C. §102 for the reasons previously discussed with respect to claim 1. In that regard, the Dazey patent suffers from the same shortcomings enumerated before and the Dazey patent, neither teaches nor suggests the step of routing and displaying the main window of the application program to a first dedicated display area that cannot display the auxiliary information and separately routing the auxiliary information to a second dedicated display area that cannot display the main window, so that the display of the auxiliary information never overlaps the display of the main window.

In the Dazey patent, when the help screen 70 is invoked, the display 50 which corresponds to the claimed main window must be resized to make room for the help display 70 so that the help screen can occupy a portion of the display area normally occupied by the main window 50. By way of example, when the help display 70 is not invoked, the main window 50 occupies a particular area of the display. When the help window 70 is invoked, it then covers or is placed in the same display area as where the main window 50 was previously. Thus, the Dazey patent actually teaches away from that provided for in claim 12 and offers no suggestion or teaching of providing the first and second dedicated display areas where the first display area

cannot display the auxiliary information and the second dedicated display area cannot display the main window. The opposite is true in the Dazey patent.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 may no longer be rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by the Dazey patent. Further, it is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken alone or in combination anticipate or make obvious that which Applicants regard as their invention as provided for in claim 12.

Claims 13 through 22 can trace their dependence to claim 12 and as such incorporate the limitations of that claim. Therefore, for the reasons just expressed with regard to the allowability of claim 12, claims 13 through 22 are neither anticipated nor made obvious by any of the references of record taken alone or in combination.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 2, 5 through 7 and 13 and 16 through 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Dazey patent in view of Endres et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,104,359). In light of the amendments made to independent claims 1 and 12, all of the dependent claims that have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 are in condition for allowance.

In the response to Applicants' Remarks, the Examiner commented on the Endres reference. His comments indicate that he does not appreciate what the Applicants were saying about the Endres reference. The statement by the Applicants that Endres is cited merely for its showing the use of a multi-monitor support feature, but does not have any of the teachings with regard to ensuring the complete separation and non-overlap of the main window of an application program by the auxiliary information. This statement was made by Applicants to further show that, like the Dazey patent, none of the references cited or applied by the Examiner

show the critical features that are provided for in independent claims 1, and 12 and their dependent claims.

Since the Dazey patent was previously cited by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that the final Action was improperly entered and should be removed and that the application should be passed to allowance.

Thus, it now appears that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions after reviewing this amendment, he cordially invited to call the undersigned attorney so that this case may receive an early Notice of Allowance. Further, should the Examiner not be persuaded by the arguments, then it is respectfully requested that the undersigned be contacted to arrange for an interview with the Examiner and his Supervisor to discuss the substance of this amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Allen S. Melser", is written over a horizontal line.

Allen S. Melser
Registration No. 27,215

Date: April 28, 2003
Customer Number 00,136
400 Seventh Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: (202) 638-6666
Atty Docket No. P65745US0